



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/639,761	08/15/2000	Mayumi Noguchi	1341.1059/JDH	4065

21171 7590 04/15/2004

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

LIN, WEN TAI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

5

DATE MAILED: 04/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/639,761

Applicant(s)

NOGUCHI ET AL.

Examiner

Wen-Tai Lin

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4, 5, 8 and 11-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-3, 6-7, 9-10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-19 are presented for examination. Claims 14-19 are newly added and Claims 1-13 have been amended.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, USC code not included in this action can be found in the prior Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 1, 4-5 and 11-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnamurthy et al. (hereafter "Krishnamurthy") [U.S. Pat. No. 6421676].
4. Krishnamurthy was cited in the previous office action.
5. As to claim 1, Krishnamurthy teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: an information collection apparatus which collects information via transmission paths from a plurality of information generation apparatuses [104-108, Fig.1; note that due to Krishnamurthy's hierarchical information collection structure, the down-stream collectors can be viewed as "information generation apparatuses" relative

Art Unit: 2154

to their up-stream collectors], wherein each of said information generation apparatuses has a generation-side information storage unit which stores the information generated due to a specific generation factor [302, Fig.3; col.3, lines 16-23], said information collection apparatus comprising:

- a table storage unit which stores a priority definition table in which respective priorities of said plurality of information generation apparatuses are defined [402, 404, Fig.4; col.5, lines 14-21; col.6, lines 21-38 and 57-65];
- an information collection unit which refers to the priority definition table upon reception of a notice from an information generation apparatus that is any of said information generation apparatuses and in which an amount of information stored on said generation-side information storage unit is available [Abstract: lines 5-10; col.5, lines 1-41], and only collects the information stored on the generation-side information storage unit of said information generation apparatus if the priority of said information generation apparatus is higher than a preset priority [col.3, lines 15-30, which teaches a general condition that data is collected based on characteristic such as priority ..., wherein the so called "preset priority" is a rather arbitrary parameter because it can either be viewed as a static parameter setting to zero (the lowest priority level) or a dynamic parameter setting to the second highest priority in a priority queue for certain time window (col.6, lines 21-57)];

and

- a collection-side information storage unit which stores the information collected by said information collection unit [112-114, Fig.1A; Fig.3].

Krishnamurthy does not specifically teach that the information generation apparatus issues the availability of data to its upstream collector when the locally stored data has reached a predetermined amount. However, Krishnamurthy teaches that data is collected based on availability of the source [col.3, lines 22-25], Krishnamurthy further teaches that current time (i.e., relative to scheduled time), current load, available depot space, and available threads are factors for determining uploading of data [col.5, lines 22-41]. As such, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that Krishnamurthy's down-stream collectors (or information generation apparatuses) could have issued data availability to their up-stream collectors when each of the local storages has reached a predetermined level, because each local storage unit has limited space.

6. As to claims 4-5 and 11-19, since the features of all these claims can also be found in claim 1, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1 above. Specifically, claims 4-5 focus on collection of only stored information with priorities higher than a preset value; claim 11 directs the similar features of claim 1's information generator to information storage unit; claims 12-13 focus on a computer recording medium, rather than a method; and claims 14-19 focuses on the log generating units of computer systems. All these slight variations are deemed to be obvious in light of Krishnamurthy's teachings, because each of Krishnamurthy's information generator unit also has data storage unit of limited size and their associated

priorities are separately assigned. Furthermore, it is obvious that Krishnamurthy's information generation and collection method is also applicable to a networked computing environment, wherein each computer is provided an event logger with event (in particular for error events) collection and reporting functionalities. As for the fact that collection of logged data could be triggered by the size of the log (see claims 17-19), such feature is also obvious because for critical data, such as captured errors, triggering the transfer of collected data is obvious and essential because this is the most efficient way to avoid overflowing local storage units.

7. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnamurthy et al. (hereafter "Krishnamurthy") [U.S. Pat. No. 6421676] in view of Official Notice.

8. As to claim 8, Krishnamurthy's teaches most of the features of these claims except for the condition for data collection is being set upon a situation: when a given error has occurred in the information generation apparatus.

However, Official Notice is taken that the feature of triggering data collection by specified errors is well known in the art. For example, under the notion of error recovery and fault tolerance, critical information (i.e., having higher priorities) is normally collected prior to that of non-critical data.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to find that Krishnamurthy's collection method may also applicable to such a critical stages wherein

higher priority is given to those data generation units that are potentially failing, because giving priority to collection of the critical data could facilitate the error recovery or fail-over processes.

9. Claims 2-3, 6-7 and 9-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 4-5 and 8 on 3/2/2004 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 11-13 on 3/2/2004 have been considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

12. In the remarks, Applicant argues that Krishnamurthy does not teach that the data collection is conditional, i.e., collecting only when the information source's priority is higher than a preset priority, because Krishnamurthy's method preserves all requests in a priority queue, rendering the fact that all information would eventually be collected.

13. The examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's argument. Specifically, since Applicant does not disclose how the "preset priority" is determined and how it is updated, etc. the preset priority is considered rather arbitrary because it can either be

Art Unit: 2154

viewed as a static parameter setting to zero (the lowest priority level) or a dynamic parameter setting to the second highest priority in a priority queue for certain time window (col.6, lines 21-57), whichever way would make Krishnamurthy's priority queue reads on this part of the claimed features. Furthermore, it is noted that although Krishnamurthy's method does preserve all requests in a priority queue, it does not mean that all information would eventually be collected. This is because lower priority information may end up being discarded because of shortage in local storage space.

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection in claims 4-5 and 8, as presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

15. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2154

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (703)305-4875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday(8:00-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703)872-9306 for official communications; and

(703)746-5516 for status inquires draft communication.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Wen-Tai Lin

April 13, 2004

Wen-Tai Lin
4/13/04